arXiv:1610.03941v3 [cond-mat.stat-mech] 29 Nov 2016

Replica Symmetry Breaking without replicas

Simone Franchini *

November 30, 2016

Abstract

We discuss the concept of *pure state* of the Replica Symmetry Breaking ansatz in finite and infinite spin systems without averaging on the disorder, nor using replicas. Consider a system of n spins $\sigma \in \Omega^n$ with the usual set $\Omega = \{-1, 1\}$ of inner states and let $\mu : \Omega^n \to [0, 1]$ be a probability measure on it (also random). We interpret the pure states as elements of a nontrivial partition of Ω^n such that the measure restricted to each of them behaves like a product measure. Starting from such definition we are able to obtain a very general variational principle. Then we reinterpret the assumptions of the RSB scheme in the above framework, identifying the associated probability measure. Finally, we apply our results to the Sherrington-Kirkpatrick model to obtain the Parisi formula. [1]

1 Introduction

Originally introduced by Parisi in order to interpret its exact solution of the Sherrington-Kirkpatrick model (SK) [1, 2], the Replica Symmetry Breaking (RSB) ansatz proved to be an extremely valuable tool in explaining properties of disordered systems. Despite many technical advances, worth to cite the proof of the free energy functional by Guerra and Talagrand [3, 4], some of its fundamental features remain quite mysterious after more than thirty years.

A central role is played by the elusive concept of *pure state*. Despite a precise definition is still lacking, it is widely acknowledged that they must satisfy some properties. For example, it is expected that the connected correlation functions associated to these states vanish in the thermodynamic limit [2]. This imply that in some sense the measure conditioned to those states can be described by a mean field model of some kind.

Perhaps, the most striking and unconventional property is that the pure states are predicted to have a hierarchical structure such that the support of the overlaps is ultrametric [2]. A considerable amount of work has been produced on this subject, culminating in a proof of ultrametricity for the SK model by

*Goethe Mathematics Institute, 10 Robert Mayer Str, 60325 Frankfurt, Germany

[1]MSC2000: 82D30, 60F10, Keywords: Spin Glasses, Replica Simmetry Breaking, Szemeredi Lemma, Parisi Formula

Panchenko [5]. Anyway, whether ultrametricity and other properties of the pure states hold in some general framework, including their representation as well defined mathematical objects, proved to be an extremely hard task and remains an open question.

A common assumption in almost all the above literature is that pure states are expected to represent thermodynamic phases, thus being collections of a thermodynamically relevant number of samples. Inspired by a recent work by Coja-Oghlan et al. which introduces tools from Graph Theory to study Belief Propagation algorithms [6], we propose that the sets of pure states can be represented using a nontrivial partition of Ω^n (Szemeredi Regularity partition, see next section or [6, 7, 9]) into subsets $S = \{S_i\}$ such that the probability measure conditioned on each S_i can be described by a system of macroscopic non interacting spin blocks. As we shall see, this introduces critical simplifications in reproducing the results of the RSB scheme, which we interpret as a technique to approximate an exchangeable measure through a sequence of *filtered* mean-field approximations (in a sense that will become clear along the path).

The paper is organized as follows. In the next section we will discuss the concept of Regularity Partition for kernels. Then, in Sections 2, 3, 4 and 5 we will describe how to use such result to define a very general variational principle for measures describing spin systems.

Even if these introductory sections provide the ground for our results, a reader mostly interested in the RSB ansatz could eventually jump to Section 6 and 7 in the first reading, where we introduce and describe our RSB measures. Finally, in Section 8 we apply our findings to the SK model.

We anticipate that the main result of the present paper is to give an alternative and self-contained derivation of the Parisi variational principle for the SK free energy via kernel regularization. Although we will briefly confront our findings with the classical methods along the exposition (and when this is possible) we won't give an exaustive comparative analysis since this would require substantial additional work to be carried on in a dedicated paper.

2 Regularity partitions.

Before entering in the core of the discussion, a little digression is mandatory in order to justify our later arguments.

In particular, we need to introduce a remarkable analytic result originally born in the context of Graph Theory and known as Szemerédi Regularity lemma [8, 9]. In one of its versions this lemma states that any bounded kernel, ie a function $W : [0,1) \times [0,1) \to \mathbb{R}$ with $\|W\|_\infty < \infty$, can be approximated in *cut distance* (see Eq. (2) below) by a step function with finite number of steps. More formally, let W and U be two $L_\infty-$bounded kernels, let A, B two subsets of $[0,1)$ and denote by $\|W\|_\square$ the *cut norm* of W, defined by the following relation

$$\|W\|_\square = \sup_{A,B} \left| \int_{A\times B} W(x,y)\, dx\, dy \right|. \tag{2.1}$$

Now let $\varphi = (\varphi_1, \varphi_2)$ be a pair of measure preserving maps. We call the *cut distance* between the kernels W and U the following quantity:

$$D_{\square}(W,U) = \inf_{\varphi} \|W - U^{\varphi}\|_{\square}, \tag{2.2}$$

where U^{φ} abbreviates for $U(\varphi_1(x), \varphi_2(y))$. The convergence in cut distance above can be shown to be weaker than the standard L_1-convergence. We do not indulge further in details as a very accurate review of this kind of distance can be found in Chapter 5 of [9].

Let V and S be a a pair of partitions of $[0,1)$ into a finite number of elements of equal size (equitable partitions). For the moment we indicate by $N_S \geq N_V \geq N$ the cardinality of V and S respectively, then

$$(V,S) = (\{V_\alpha\}_{1\leq\alpha\leq N_V}, \{S_i\}_{1\leq i\leq N_S}). \tag{2.3}$$

Moreover, it will be also convenient to introduce the following notation

$$\overline{W}(A,B) = \frac{1}{|A||B|}\int_{A\times B} W(x,y)\,dx\,dy, \tag{2.4}$$

for the the average of $W(x,y)$ on $A\times B$. We are now ready to give the *Szemeredi Regularity Lemma* (we first present a weak variant originally from Frieze and Kannan, see Chapter 9 of [9])

Lemma 1. *There is a pair of equitable partitions V and S of $[0,1)$ into a finite number of elements as above such that the step function*

$$U_0(x,y) = \sum_{i=1}^{N_S}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{N_V} \overline{W}(V_\alpha, S_i)\,\mathbb{I}_{\{x\in V_\alpha,\, y\in S_i\}} \tag{2.5}$$

is close to W in cut distance, ie it satisfies the inequality

$$D_{\square}(W,U_0) \leq \epsilon(N) \tag{2.6}$$

for some function $\epsilon(N)\to 0$ uniformly as $N\to\infty$. Conversely, for any finite and positive ϵ there is a pair of partitions (V,S) of $[0,1)\times[0,1)$ as before and a function $N(\epsilon)<\infty$ such that $D_{\square}(W,U)\leq\epsilon$.

Proof. The proof can be found in Chapter 9 of [9] □

Notice that above statement deals with bounded kernels, but we can also consider L_1-bounded kernels and give a stronger version as follows

Lemma 2. *There is a pair of equitable partitions such that*

$$U(x,y) = \sum_{i=1}^{N_S}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{N_V} U_\alpha^i(x,y)\,\mathbb{I}_{\{x\in V_\alpha,\, y\in S_i\}} \tag{2.7}$$

will satisfy the inequality $D_{\square}(W,U)\leq\epsilon(N)$ for any set of kernels U_α^i that fulfill the condition $D_{\square}(W_\alpha^i, U_\alpha^i) = 0$, with $W_\alpha^i(x,y) = W(x,y)\,\mathbb{I}_{\{x\in V_\alpha,\, y\in S_i\}}$. Hereafter we will call (V,S) an $\epsilon-$regular partition of W.

Proof. We define a refinement of each $(V_\alpha,\, S_i)$ block into N' elements. Then, by Lemma 1 there is a kernel $\delta U^i_\alpha = U^i_\alpha - \overline{W}\,(V_\alpha, S_i)$ that is at cut distance $\epsilon\,(N')$ from $\delta W^i_\alpha = W^i_\alpha - \overline{W}\,(V_\alpha, S_i)$. The proof follows by taking $N' \to \infty$, see also Chapter 9 of [9]. □

From an intuitive point of view this lemma provides an extension to distributions of the fact that any continuous function can be uniformly approximated by a step function. Indeed, it could be seen as a Riemann integrable approximation of a Lebesgue integrable function.

We remark that even if we implicitly assumed that N_V and N_S can be distinct this is not a mandatory requirement to construct a regularity partition. In fact all of the above results still hold if we take $N_V = N_S = N$ as far as their value is larger than $N\,(\epsilon)$ [9]. For almost all this paper we will take

$$N_V = N_S = N \geq N\,(\epsilon)\,, \tag{2.8}$$

but this is an important point to keep in mind, as it will originate an interesting symmetry when dealing with the SK model in Section 8.

It is also crucial to notice that any refinement of an $\epsilon-$regular partition (V, S), ie a partition generated by further splitting each $V_\alpha,\, S_i$, will produce an $\epsilon'-$regular partition with non increasing error in the sense that if (V', Σ') is a refinement of (V, Σ) then the error ϵ' associated to the refinement is $\epsilon' \leq \epsilon$. Conversely, if we join some V_α, S_i together we will obtain a $\epsilon''-$partition with non decreasing error, ie $\epsilon'' \geq \epsilon$. These facts will play a central role when time will come to work out our sequence of RSB measures.

3 Kernel representation for measures

Let Ω^n the product space of n spins with finite number of inner states, let $\mathcal{P}\,(\Omega^n)$ the ensemble of all probability measures on Ω^n and let $\mu \in \mathcal{P}\,(\Omega^n)$ some probability measure. We denote by (Ω^n, μ) our model and by μ_K the marginal distribution of μ over a subset $K \subset \{1 \dots n\}$ of k distinct spin coordinates. If $S_i,\, i \geq 1$ is a partition of Ω^n into N disjoint subsets we call μ^i the measure conditioned to S_i and by μ^i_K the marginal distribution of μ^i over K.

The connection between Szemeredi partitions and the pure states of the RSB ansatz has been first noticed in [6], where it is shown that for any measure μ on Ω^n it is possible take some arbitrary small $\epsilon > 0$ and a partition of Ω^n into a finite number (not depending on n) of disjoint S_i such that $\mu\,(S_0) \leq \epsilon$ and

$$\sum_{K \in \{1,\, \dots\, n\}^k} \left\| \mu^i_K - \bigotimes\nolimits_{a \in K} \mu^i_a \right\|_{TV} \leq \epsilon\, n^{\,k},\ \forall i \tag{3.1}$$

if n is chosen large enough (we denoted by $\|\cdot\|_{TV}$ the total variation distance). The above result tells us that for any measure on a system of variables with finite number of inner states (here we assume $\Omega = \{-1, 1\}$) we can decompose our sample space into a finite number of regular disjoint subsets $S_i,\, i \geq 1$ plus one

irregular S_0 with $\mu(S_0) \leq \epsilon$ such that for any regular subset S_i the marginals of μ^i over a randomly chosen set K can be approximated by a product measure in the sense of Eq. (3.1). The number of such regular subsets only depends on k, $|\Omega|$ and the level of precision ϵ we want to achieve for our approximation, and it does not depend on the size n of the system. A formal proof of Eq. (3.1) can be found in [6].

The logic behind the above result relies on the Szemeredi lemma presented in the previous section and we stress that this will become intuitively evident in short, after we introduce a suitable representation for μ. Then, let label the spin vectors of our sample space Ω^n (clearly the labeling can be arbitrary)

$$\Omega^n = \left\{\tau^k\right\}_{1\leq k\leq 2^n},\ \tau^k = \left\{\tau_a^k\right\}_{1\leq a\leq n} \tag{3.2}$$

and define the *magnetization kernel* M_μ associated to the the model (Ω^n, μ) as follows:

$$M_\mu(x,y) = \sum_{a=1}^{n}\sum_{k=1}^{2^n} \tau_a^k\, \mathbb{I}_{\{x\in[x_{a-1},x_a),\, y\in[y_{k-1},y_k)\}} \tag{3.3}$$

which is a step function where the measures of the steps x_a and y_k are given by

$$x_a = a/n,\ y_k = \sum_{j=1}^{k}\mu(\tau^j). \tag{3.4}$$

As before, for some pair of intervals $A, B \subseteq [0,1)$ we indicate the mean value of M_μ with $\overline{M}_\mu(A,B)$, whose definition is given by Eq.(2.4). Notice that $\overline{M}_\mu(A,B)$ satisfies the relation

$$|A|\,|B|\,\overline{M}_\mu(A,B) = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{a\in A^*}\langle\, \boldsymbol{\sigma}_a\, \mathbb{I}_{\{\boldsymbol{\sigma}\in B^*\}}\rangle_\mu.$$

Since we will work both with kernels and spin-state variables, hereafter it will be convenient to mark the variables of the actual system $A^* \subset \{1,\dots,n\}$ and $B^* \subset \Omega^n$ with an upper star and drop the mark when indicating the image sets A, B of A^* and B^* on $[0,1)$. Notice that $n\,|A| = |A^*|$ and $|B| = \mu(B^*)$ (with a little abuse of notation for B^* we could write $B^* = \mu^{-1}(B)$).

We can now define a cut norm $\|\mu\|_\square$ for the measure μ simply as the cut norm of its magnetization kernel

$$\|\mu\|_\square = \sup_{A,B}|A|\,|B|\left|\overline{M}_\mu(A,B)\right| \tag{3.5}$$

and a cut distance $D_\square(\mu,\eta)$ between two measures μ and η as the cut distance between their kernels

$$D_\square(\mu,\eta) = D_\square(M_\mu, M_\eta). \tag{3.6}$$

As we shall see in short we can use Szemeredi Lemma to explicitly construct converging sequences of measures. We remark that the equality in cut distance

between probability measures is a very weak form of congruence, even compared to the usual equality in distribution, but it's still capable to capture intensive like the free energy density as it is proven better than *weak** convergence, ie

$$\langle G(\boldsymbol{\sigma})\rangle_{\mu} = \lim_{D_{\square}(\mu,\eta)\to 0} \langle G(\boldsymbol{\sigma})\rangle_{\eta} \tag{3.7}$$

at least pointwise for any smooth G, see [6, 9]).

That said, to get one of such converging sequences it suffices to notice that any measure whose kernel is equal to the step function defined by an $\epsilon-$regular partition will have a magnetization kernel that is at most at ϵ from M_{μ} in cut distance, and will converge to μ as $\epsilon \to 0$. Hence, we can rewrite the Szemeredi lemma for measures into the following variational principle.

Lemma 3. *For any ϵ there is a pair of partitions*

$$(V, S) = (\{V_{\alpha}\}_{1\leq\alpha\leq N}, \{S_i\}_{1\leq i\leq N}). \tag{3.8}$$

of $[0,1)$ into a finite number N of elements of equal size such that the measure

$$\eta(\sigma) = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\prod_{\alpha=1}^{N}\eta_{\alpha}^{i}(\sigma) \tag{3.9}$$

satisfy the desired inequality $D_{\square}(\mu,\eta) < \epsilon(N)$ for any set of measures

$$\eta_{\alpha}^{i} : \Omega^{|V_{\alpha}^{*}|} \to [0,1] \tag{3.10}$$

that fulfill the self-consistency relations $D_{\square}\left(\mu_{\alpha}^{i}, \eta_{\alpha}^{i}\right) = 0$.

Proof. The proof follows by computing the kernel associated to η

$$M_{\eta}(x,y) = \sum_{i=1}^{N}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{N} M_{\eta_{\alpha}^{i}}(x,y)\,\mathbb{I}_{\left\{x\in V_{\alpha_i},\, y\in S_i\right\}} \tag{3.11}$$

and use Lemma 2. See also [6, 7] for a measure theoretic approach. □

Notice that any eventual difference between μ and η originates from the fact that in general

$$M_{\mu^i}(x,y) \neq \frac{1}{N}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{N} M_{\mu_{\alpha}^{i}}(x,y)\,\mathbb{I}_{\left\{x\in V_{\alpha_i}\right\}} \tag{3.12}$$

unless μ^i is a product measure. If we generate our kernel from μ^i according to Eq. (3.3) it will describe a probability space in which events involving sites in V_{α}^{*} will be measurable (in general) only by the algebra of events involving all the n sites, while if we generate the kernel from μ_{α}^{i} then the events of V_{α}^{*} can be measured by the algebra of the events involving the V_{α}^{*} sites only (see also the definition of *Stepping Operator* in Chapter 9 of [9]).

Since our aim is to identify the sets S_i^* with the pure states of the RSB ansatz, we will refer to them as *pure states* of η, while we will refer to the V_α^* sets as *pure states components.*

The approximated kernel above is equivalent to the linear combination of N probability measures, each one describing N systems independently sampled from different components inside a pure state. Hence, we expect that computing quantities using η instead of μ is an approximation at least equivalent to the Replica Trick of [2] (see at the end of the Section 5 for some more about the replicated version of our kernel in a general context).

4 Representation using auxiliary random variables

We can give an intuitive picture of the above result starting from the exact formula

$$\mu(\sigma) = \sum_{k=1}^{2^n} \mu(\tau^k) \prod_{a=1}^{n} \left(\frac{1 + \tau_a^k \sigma_a}{2} \right) \tag{4.1}$$

and rewriting it as follows

$$\mu(\sigma) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \mu(S_i^*)\, \mu^i(\sigma), \tag{4.2}$$

where $\mu^i(\sigma)$ is the measure conditioned to the $i-$th pure state S_i^*

$$\mu^i(\sigma) = \sum_{\tau^k \in S_i^*} \frac{\mu(\tau^k)}{\mu(S_i^*)} \prod_{a \in V_\alpha^*} \left(\frac{1 + \tau_a^k \sigma_a}{2} \right). \tag{4.3}$$

The approximation consists in replacing $\mu^i(\sigma)$ with the product measure

$$\mu^i(\sigma) \to \eta^i(\sigma) = \prod_{\alpha=1}^{N} \eta_\alpha^i(\sigma) \tag{4.4}$$

and argue that any intensive quantity computed according to $\eta^i(\sigma)$ will approach to that obtained from $\mu^i(\sigma)$, as far as $\epsilon \to 0$ (and $N \to \infty$) by means of the cut distance convergence of their kernels.

Given that σ is a binary variable, if we assume Replica Symmetric pure states we could simply follow [6, 7] and take

$$\eta_\alpha^i(\sigma) = \prod_{a \in V_\alpha^*} \left(\frac{1 + m_a^i \sigma_a}{2} \right), \; m_a^i = \langle \boldsymbol{\sigma}_a \rangle_{\mu_a^i}. \tag{4.5}$$

Anyway, we remark that the choice of the η_α^i measures is arbitrary apart from the above conditions. This indicates that all the informations we are keeping from μ are stored in the array $\{m_a^i\}$ of the averages m_a^i defined in Eq. (4.5).

Then, although the obvious choice for η_α^i would be the product measure between the marginals μ_a^i, for practical convenience we will use an equivalent representation that encodes the distributions of the pure states components into random variables.

In the following we represent random variables with bold fonts. Since we are going to introduce some auxiliary randomness, we will use a distinct notation for the averages respect to these variables. Then, let $\boldsymbol{M} \in [0,1]^{N^2}$ be a real valued random matrix

$$\boldsymbol{M} = \{\boldsymbol{m}^i\}_{1\leq i\leq N},\ \boldsymbol{m}^i = \{\boldsymbol{m}_\alpha^i\}_{1\leq\alpha\leq N} \tag{4.6}$$

distributed according to the distribution p

$$\boldsymbol{M} \sim p:\ [0,1]^{N^2} \to [0,1]\,. \tag{4.7}$$

And define the non-random measure η as the expectation $\eta = \mathbb{E}_p\, \eta_{\boldsymbol{M}}$, where $\eta_{\boldsymbol{M}}$ is a random measure dependent on the random matrix $\boldsymbol{M}$ trough the equation

$$\eta_{\boldsymbol{M}}(\sigma) = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\prod_{\alpha=1}^{N}\boldsymbol{\eta}_\alpha^i(\sigma)\,. \tag{4.8}$$

The $\boldsymbol{\eta}_\alpha^i$ are chosen to be Bernoulli random measures

$$\boldsymbol{\eta}_\alpha^i(\sigma) = \prod_{a\in V_\alpha^*}\left(\frac{1+\boldsymbol{m}_\alpha^i\sigma_a}{2}\right), \tag{4.9}$$

uniquely defined through the unidimensional random parameters $\boldsymbol{M}$. Using the Doob representation we can rewrite the random matrix $\boldsymbol{M} = M + \Gamma\cdot\boldsymbol{X}$ where M is a deterministic matrix, Γ is a deterministic tensor

$$\Gamma = \{\gamma_{\alpha\beta}^{ij}\}_{i,j,\alpha,\beta} \in \mathbb{R}^{N^4} \tag{4.10}$$

and $\boldsymbol{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{N^2}$ is a real valued random matrix

$$\boldsymbol{X} = \{\boldsymbol{x}^i\}_{1\leq i\leq N},\ \boldsymbol{x}^i = \{\boldsymbol{x}_\alpha^i\}_{1\leq\alpha\leq N} \tag{4.11}$$

that has random i.i.d. entryes. Explicitly, $\boldsymbol{x}_\alpha^i \sim \psi_\alpha^i : \mathbb{R}\to[0,1]$ and $\boldsymbol{X}\sim\psi$ with

$$\psi = \bigotimes_{\alpha=1}^{N}\bigotimes_{i=1}^{N}\psi_\alpha^i \tag{4.12}$$

product measure between the $\boldsymbol{x}_\alpha^i$ distributions. For simpliplicity in the followings we assume that $M=0$ and that $\boldsymbol{x}_\alpha^i$ are independent, centered and of unitary variance, hence

$$\mathbb{E}_{\psi_\alpha^i}(\boldsymbol{x}_\alpha^i) = 0,\ \mathbb{E}_\psi(\boldsymbol{x}_\alpha^i\boldsymbol{x}_\beta^j) = \mathbb{E}_{\psi_\alpha^i\otimes\psi_\beta^j}(\boldsymbol{x}_\alpha^i\boldsymbol{x}_\beta^j) = \delta_{i,j}\delta_{\alpha,\beta}. \tag{4.13}$$

We can write explicitly the relation between the components of $\boldsymbol{M}$, $\boldsymbol{X}$ and Γ for $M = 0$:

$$\boldsymbol{m}_{\alpha}^{i} = \sum_{j=1}^{N} \sum_{\beta=1}^{N} \gamma_{\alpha\beta}^{ij} \, \boldsymbol{x}_{\beta}^{j}. \tag{4.14}$$

Clearly the relation between the associated measures is

$$\eta = \mathbb{E}_{p} \, \eta_{\boldsymbol{M}} = \mathbb{E}_{\psi} \, \eta_{\, M + \Gamma \cdot \boldsymbol{X}} \, . \tag{4.15}$$

First notice that the value of $\boldsymbol{m}_{\alpha}^{i}$ can be measured by events involving V_{α}^{*} only. Since for the average magnetizations always hold

$$\frac{1}{|V_{\alpha}^{*}|} \sum_{a \in V_{\alpha}^{*}} \langle \, \boldsymbol{\sigma}_{a} \, \rangle_{\eta_{\alpha}^{i}} = \overline{M}_{\mu} \left(V_{\alpha}, S_{i} \right) \tag{4.16}$$

we add a self-consistency relation that preserve the equality between the field value of each spin site and its average on the regular volume

$$|V_{\alpha}^{*}| \, \boldsymbol{m}_{\alpha}^{i} = \sum_{a \in V_{\alpha}^{*}} \boldsymbol{m}_{a}^{i}, \;\; \boldsymbol{m}_{a}^{i} \sim \mu_{a}^{i}. \tag{4.17}$$

Then, given the filtration of events space described before, we can conclude that $\boldsymbol{m}_{\alpha}^{i}$ will be distributed according to the sum rule for independent random variables. We can explicitly link the p_{α}^{i} marginals with the partitions by computing the convolution between the marginal distributions μ_{a}^{i} on the single spin sites of V_{α}^{*} conditioned to the $i-$th pure state. This convolution relations can be most easily expressed in Fourier representation

$$\hat{p}_{\alpha}^{\, i} \left(z \right) = |V_{\alpha}^{*}| \prod_{a \in V_{\alpha}^{*}} \hat{\mu}_{a}^{\, i} \left(z \right), \tag{4.18}$$

where $\hat{f}$ denotes the Fourier transform of some function $f \in L_{1}$

$$\hat{f} \left(z \right) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{x \in [0,1]} dx \, f \left(x \right) \, e^{-ixz}, \tag{4.19}$$

$$f \left(x \right) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{z \in \mathbb{R}} dx \, \hat{f} \left(z \right) \, e^{ixz}. \tag{4.20}$$

Since we aim to use the above approximation to study models that exhibit a Replica Symmetry Breaking behavior it will be useful to verify that our measure has a nontrivial overlap distribution. Then, let $\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \boldsymbol{\sigma}' \in \Omega^{n}$ two independent samples and let $P \left(Q \right)$ the overlap distribution of the (Ω^{n}, η) model. By introducing $P^{ij} \left(Q \right) = \eta^{i} \otimes \eta^{j} \left(\boldsymbol{\sigma} \boldsymbol{\sigma}' = Q \right)$ we can write the overlap distribution as follows

$$P \left(Q \right) = \frac{1}{N^{2}} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{j=1}^{N} P^{ij} \left(Q \right) \tag{4.21}$$

Let T_Q the set of spin vectors $\tau \in \Omega^n$ such that $\sum_a \tau_a = Q$, and let $P_a^{ij}(\tau_a) = \eta_a^i \otimes \eta_a^j (\boldsymbol{\sigma}_a \boldsymbol{\sigma}'_a = \tau_a)$ a collection of random distributions representing the products of the conditional measures inside the pure states i, j, and marginalized over a given site a. By definitions we see that for any $a \in V_\alpha^*$ holds $P_a^{ij}(1) = m_a^i m_a^j + \bar{m}_a^i \bar{m}_a^j$ and $P_a^{ij}(-1) = m_a^i \bar{m}_a^j + \bar{m}_a^i m_a^j$ (hereafter for any number $c \in [0,1]$ we denote its complement $\bar{c} = 1 - c$ with an over-bar). Then we can write each $P^{ij}(Q)$ above as

$$P^{ij}(Q) = \sum_{\tau \in T_Q} \prod_{\alpha=1}^{N} \prod_{a \in V_\alpha^*} P_a^{ij}(\tau_a). \tag{4.22}$$

Notice that the $P^{ij}(Q)$ are multinomial distributions parametrized by the m^i vectors, and by simple combinatorial arguments it is not hard to see that each of the normalized variables $q = Q/n$ will be tight distributed around its mean value

$$q^{ij} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\alpha=1}^{N} \frac{1}{|V_\alpha^*|} \sum_{a \in V_\alpha^*} m_a^i m_a^j = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{a=1}^{n} m_a^i m_a^j \tag{4.23}$$

for $n \to \infty$, thus giving a distribution of the normalized overlaps converging to

$$P_\eta(q) \to \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{j=1}^{N} \delta\left(q - q^{ij}\right) \tag{4.24}$$

and the limit expression of the reduced overlap matrix in the form

$$Q_\eta(\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \boldsymbol{\sigma}') = \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \boldsymbol{\sigma} \boldsymbol{\sigma}' = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{j=1}^{N} q^{ij} \mathbb{I}_{\left\{\boldsymbol{\sigma} \in S_i^*, \boldsymbol{\sigma}' \in S_j^*\right\}} \tag{4.25}$$

for any $\boldsymbol{\sigma} \neq \boldsymbol{\sigma}'$. Clearly, the coefficents can be also computed using the random variables rapresentation. The overlap matrix associated to the measure $\boldsymbol{\eta}_M$ is in fact

$$Q_{\boldsymbol{M}}(\sigma, \sigma') = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\alpha=1}^{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{j=1}^{N} \boldsymbol{m}_\alpha^i \boldsymbol{m}_\alpha^j \mathbb{I}_{\left\{\sigma \in S_i^*, \sigma' \in S_j^*\right\}}, \tag{4.26}$$

then the overlap matrix associated to η is

$$Q_\eta(\sigma, \sigma') = \mathbb{E}_p Q_{\boldsymbol{M}}(\sigma, \sigma') = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{j=1}^{N} q^{ij} \mathbb{I}_{\left\{\sigma \in S_i^*, \sigma' \in S_j^*\right\}} \tag{4.27}$$

where $q^{ij} = \mathbb{E}_p(\boldsymbol{m}_\alpha^i \boldsymbol{m}_\alpha^j)$ is the support. By noticing that

$$\mathbb{E}_p(\boldsymbol{m}_\alpha^i \boldsymbol{m}_\alpha^j) = \sum_{k=1}^{N} \sum_{k'=1}^{N} \sum_{\delta=1}^{N} \sum_{\delta'=1}^{N} \gamma_{\alpha\delta}^{ik} \gamma_{\beta\delta'}^{jk'} \mathbb{E}_\psi(\boldsymbol{x}_\delta^k \boldsymbol{x}_{\delta'}^{k'}) = \sum_{j=1}^{N} \sum_{\delta=1}^{n} \gamma_{\alpha\delta}^{ik} \gamma_{\beta\delta}^{jk}. \tag{4.28}$$

we find that the support of the overlap matrix is given by

$$q^{ij} = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{N} \mathbb{E}_p(\boldsymbol{m}_\alpha^i \boldsymbol{m}_\alpha^j) = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{N}\sum_{k=1}^{N}\sum_{\delta=1}^{n} \gamma_{\alpha\delta}^{ik}\,\gamma_{\alpha\delta}^{jk}. \tag{4.29}$$

It can be shown that the reduced overlap distribution $P_\eta(q)$ of the approximated model (Ω^n, η) and that of the original one (Ω^n, μ) are the same up to an error $O(\epsilon)$ in total variation for n large enough.

We remark that since the sizes of the V_α^*, S_i^* sets are respectively $|V_\alpha^*| = O(n)$ and $\mu(S_i^*) = |S_i| = O(1)$ we really need some form of Szemeredi partition if we want to obtain meaningful results. Indeed, the very existence of $\epsilon-$regular partitions for any bounded kernel should be regarded as an highly non-trivial fact as they can in principle return non zero values for the coefficients $\boldsymbol{m}_\alpha^i$. To be convinced of this it suffice to notice that in models with constant average magnetization (as the Sherrington-Kirkpatrick model) any randomly constructed partition will give all equal coefficients almost surely due the Central Limit Theorem, thus preventing us from keeping any information about the measure μ we want to approximate.

It should be also noticed that Eq.s (4.8) and (4.9) provide a very general variational principle. To see this let's spent some words on the special case of Gibbs measures. Let

$$\rho(\sigma) = Z^{-1}e^{-\beta\mathcal{H}(\sigma)},\ Z = \sum_{\sigma\in\Omega^n} e^{-\beta\mathcal{H}(\sigma)}, \tag{4.30}$$

be a Gibbs measure of Hamiltonian $\mathcal{H}: \Omega^n \to (-\infty, \infty)$. We recall that the free energy is usually defined from the partition function as $F = \beta^{-1}\log Z$ but we can give an alternative definition by the functional

$$\mathcal{F}_\beta[\mu, \mathcal{H}] = \langle \mathcal{H}(\sigma) - \frac{1}{\beta}\log\mu(\sigma)\rangle_\mu. \tag{4.31}$$

Then, the free energy is given by

$$F = \mathcal{F}_\beta[\rho, \mathcal{H}] = \inf_{\mu\in\mathcal{P}(\Omega^n)} \mathcal{F}_\beta[\,\mu, \mathcal{H}], \tag{4.32}$$

where $\mathcal{P}(\Omega^n)$ is the set of probability measures on Ω^n. Since we can arbitrary approximate ρ by a mixture of product measures ρ' at the cost of an error ϵ in cut distance, we can also approximate F_β (indeed give an increasingly optimal upper bound) by searching our minimum over the possible arrays of parametes M, Γ instead of $\mathcal{P}(\Omega^n)$

$$F'_\beta = \mathcal{F}_\beta[\rho', \mathcal{H}] = \inf_{M\in N^2, \Gamma\in N^4} \langle\, \mathcal{H}(\sigma) - \frac{1}{\beta}\log\mu(\sigma)\,\rangle_{\mathbb{E}_\psi \eta_{M+\Gamma\cdot \boldsymbol{x}}}. \tag{4.33}$$

We expect that the corresponding free energy per particle F'_β/n will converge to F_β/n as $\epsilon \to 0$ for any n, although the rate of convergence could be very slow depending on the details of the model (see also [6, 7, 9]). We won't further discuss this application here, but we believe this may be a fact of particular interest from the computational side since to obtain F_β^* we would "only" need to minimize over a finite collection of parameters as far as ϵ remains finite.

5 Generalized kernels

This section deals with an extension of the above description to general kernels. In the previous section we used the magnetization kernel of Eq. (3.3) to define our approximated measure, but is it the only possible? Indeed we can generate kernels from any local quantity, and eventually work with the one that best fit to our problem. Then, let $\sigma \in \Omega^n$, let

$$h(\sigma) = \{h_a(\sigma)\}_{1\leq a\leq n}\,,\ h_a(\sigma) \in \Lambda \subset \mathbb{R}, \tag{5.1}$$

be a collection of L_2-bounded functions and suppose we find convenient to work directly with the probability measure $\xi : \Lambda^n \to [0,1]$ describing the random variable $h(\boldsymbol{\sigma})$. From here we embed our variables in a continuous space and use the vector $\phi \in \Lambda^n$ as dummy variable to explicitly represent ξ. That said, we can start from the exact relation

$$\xi(\phi) = \sum_{k=1}^{2^n} \mu(\tau^k) \prod_{a=1}^{n} \delta\left(\phi_a - h_a\left(\tau^k\right)\right) \tag{5.2}$$

and proceed essentially as before, ie by defining a generalized kernel depending from μ and h

$$H_\xi(x,y) = \sum_{a=1}^{n}\sum_{k=1}^{2^n} h_a(\tau^k)\,\mathbb{I}_{\{x\in[x_{a-1},x_a),\,y\in[y_{k-1},y_k)\}}, \tag{5.3}$$

where the coefficients are given by Eq. (2.4). By Szemeredi lemma we can give a generalized version of Lemma 3:

Lemma 4. *For any $\epsilon \geq 0$ there is a pair of partitions (V,S) of $[0,1)$ into a finite number N of elements of equal size such that the measure*

$$\zeta(\phi) = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\prod_{\alpha=1}^{N}\zeta_\alpha^i(\phi) \tag{5.4}$$

is at cut distance $D_\square(\xi,\zeta) \leq \epsilon$ for any measure ζ_α^i that satisfy $D_\square\left(\xi_\alpha^i,\zeta_\alpha^i\right) = 0$ as before.

Proof. Same of Lemma 3 with the generalized kernel on behalf of the magnetization kernel. □

We can use the random representation introduced in the previous section by defining the random matrix

$$\boldsymbol{H} = \{\boldsymbol{m}^i\}_{1\leq i\leq N},\ \boldsymbol{m}^i = \{\boldsymbol{m}_\alpha^i\}_{1\leq\alpha\leq N} \tag{5.5}$$

distributed according to the distribution p

$$\boldsymbol{H} \sim p :\ \Lambda^{N^2} \to [0,1]\,, \tag{5.6}$$

then as before we define $\zeta(\phi) = \mathbb{E}_p \zeta_{\boldsymbol{H}}(\phi)$ and

$$\zeta_{\boldsymbol{H}}(\phi) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \prod_{\alpha=1}^{N} \boldsymbol{\zeta}_\alpha^i(\phi). \tag{5.7}$$

Since we are now working on a continuous support it will be convenient to chose the Dirac distribution to represent the random measures $\boldsymbol{\zeta}_\alpha^i$

$$\boldsymbol{\zeta}_\alpha^i(\phi) = \prod_{a \in V_\alpha^*} \delta\left(\phi_a - \boldsymbol{h}_\alpha^i\right). \tag{5.8}$$

Also in this case for the averages hold

$$\frac{1}{|V_\alpha^*|} \sum_{a \in V_\alpha^*} \langle \boldsymbol{h}_a \rangle_{\zeta_\alpha^i} = \overline{H}_\mu(V_\alpha, S_i) = h_\alpha^i. \tag{5.9}$$

and p_α^i are then given by the convolution rule of Eq. (4.18).

$$\hat{p}_\alpha^i(z) = |V_\alpha^*| \prod_{a \in V_\alpha^*} \hat{\xi}_a^i(z). \tag{5.10}$$

Clearly the overlap distribution can be defined also for overlaps between the $\boldsymbol{h} = h(\boldsymbol{\sigma})$ variables (generalized overlaps). We will obtain as before that the distribution of $\boldsymbol{q} = \boldsymbol{h}\boldsymbol{h}'/n$ converges to

$$P_\zeta(q) \to \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{j=1}^{N} \delta\left(q - q^{ij}\right), \tag{5.11}$$

where the symbol q^{ij} again indicates the support of the overlaps between pure states

$$q^{ij} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\alpha=1}^{N} \mathbb{E}_p(\boldsymbol{h}_\alpha^i \boldsymbol{h}_\alpha^j). \tag{5.12}$$

This also gives the expression for the generalized overlap matrix in the limit of large n

$$Q_\zeta(\boldsymbol{h}, \boldsymbol{h}') \to \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{j=1}^{N} q^{ij} \mathbb{I}_{\left\{\boldsymbol{h} \in S_i^*,\, \boldsymbol{h}' \in S_j^*\right\}}. \tag{5.13}$$

Our aim is to apply the above formulation to the cavity representation of the SK free energy, then hereafter we will work with the generalized variables only.

It is straightforward to obtan the replicated version of ζ from its kernel. Since we constructed ζ such that its kernel is independent for (V_α, S_i) and equal to $\boldsymbol{h}_\alpha^i$, then we can reorder the partitions by applying the following measure preserving map. Pick a pair (a, k) from each of the N^2 sets (V_α^*, S_i^*) to form (A_1^*, B_1^*) and iterate the procedure for n/N times to obtain a partition of $[0,1]^2$ into $(n/N)^2$ elements (A_α, B_i), $1 \le \alpha, i \le n/N$ such that the subkernels

$$R_\alpha^i(x, y) = \int_{[0,1)\times[0,1)} H_\zeta(x, y)\, \mathbb{I}_{\{x \in A_\alpha,\, y \in B_i\}}\, dx\, dy \tag{5.14}$$

are identical in cut distance, ie $D_{\square}(R^i_\alpha, R^j_\beta) = 0$. Since the map is measure preserving (the same is obtained by considering a random mixing of the indexes) it follows that the kernel

$$R\left(x,y\right) = \sum_{i=1}^{n/N} \sum_{\alpha=1}^{n/N} R_1^1\left(x,y\right) \mathbb{I}_{\{x\in A_\alpha,\, y\in B_i\}}, \tag{5.15}$$

will be itself at cut distance $D_{\square}\left(R, H_\zeta\right) = 0$ from that associated to ζ, and we can see that R represents the product space of n/N identical replicas, each distributed according to ζ rescaled with $n \to N$. This defines the scaling under replication.

Moreover, we can get some insights about the physical nature of our approximation trough studying the action of ζ on the generalized $n-$point correlation function $G\left(\boldsymbol{h}_1\right) G\left(\boldsymbol{h}_2\right) ... G\left(\boldsymbol{h}_n\right)$ for some smooth positive G. From definitions

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \prod_{a=1}^{n} G\left(\boldsymbol{h}_a\right)\rangle_\zeta = \mathbb{E}_p \langle \prod_{a=1}^{n} G\left(\boldsymbol{h}_a\right)\rangle_{\zeta_{\boldsymbol{H}}} = \mathbb{E}_p \int_{\phi\in\Lambda^n} d\phi\ \zeta_{\boldsymbol{H}}\left(\phi\right) \prod_{a=1}^{n} G\left(\phi_a\right) = \\
= \mathbb{E}_p \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \prod_{\alpha=1}^{N} \int_{\phi\in\Lambda^{|V^*_\alpha|}} d\phi\ \ \boldsymbol{\zeta}^i_\alpha\left(\phi\right) \prod_{a\in V^*_\alpha} G\left(\phi_a\right) = \\
= \mathbb{E}_p \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \prod_{\alpha=1}^{N} G\left(\boldsymbol{h}^i_\alpha\right)^{n/N} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathbb{E}_{p^i} \prod_{\alpha=1}^{N} G\left(\boldsymbol{h}^i_\alpha\right)^{n/N}.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.16}$$

Notice that $N < \infty$, then in the limit $n \to \infty$ we simply get

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \langle \prod_{a=1}^{n} G\left(\boldsymbol{h}_a\right)\rangle_\zeta^{1/n} = \sup_i\ \mathbb{E}_{p^i} \prod_{\alpha=1}^{N} G\left(\boldsymbol{h}^i_\alpha\right)^{1/N}. \tag{5.17}$$

Now consider an infinite series of independent experiments in which we measure the $k-$point correlation function between k randomly chosen site $\boldsymbol{K}$. If we take an infinite number of experiments on an infinite sample we obtain

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \langle \prod_{a\in\boldsymbol{K}} G\left(\boldsymbol{h}_a\right)\rangle_\zeta^{1/k} = \langle \prod_{a=1}^{n} G\left(\boldsymbol{h}_a\right)\rangle_\zeta^{1/n},\ a.s. \tag{5.18}$$

for any finite N. On the contrary, the result of an infinite number of experiments involving only $k < N$ sites won't ensure an accurate description for any intensive quantity as there is no way to sample spins from each of the N components by picking less than N sites.

The same will happen if we take a finite series $t < N$ of measurements on an infinite sample $k \to \infty$ since this time we won't be able to sample all the pure states (clearly for $t \geq N$ we will obtain a complete description). Notice that if we allow $N \to \infty$ as predicted by the fullRSB ansatz, we will need an infinite sampling of both spin and replica spaces to exactly reconstruct ζ from its correlation functions.

6 RSB measures

Generally speaking, basic mean field theories approximate the target functional (for example the free energy density) by restricting the search of the minimizer in the subset of product measures between marginal distributions on single spin sites. In this sense the RS measure is an improved mean field theory, as it suppresses correlations between infinitesimal components of size $O(n)$ and keep track of correlations only inside these components. By definitions above we can represent an RS measure by taking $N = 1$ in Eq. (5.7) of the previous section,

$$\zeta_{RS}(\phi) = \mathbb{E}_p \prod_{a=1}^{n} \delta(\phi_a - \boldsymbol{h}), \tag{6.1}$$

with $\boldsymbol{h} \sim p$ given by Eq. (5.10) and $\mathbb{E}_p \boldsymbol{h} = h$.

As we shall see in short, the 1RSB approximation further generalize by considering an intermediate decorrelation, this time between macroscopic components of the pure states. Given the algebra separation induced by neglecting correlations between the blocks our first step of RSB can be described by the following measure

$$\zeta_{1-RSB}(\phi) = \mathbb{E}_{\bar{p}} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \prod_{\alpha=1}^{N} \mathbb{E}_{\bar{p}_\alpha^i} \boldsymbol{\zeta}_\alpha^{\,i}(\phi), \tag{6.2}$$

where $\boldsymbol{\zeta}_{\alpha_1}^{i_1}$ is a random measure defined trough

$$\boldsymbol{\zeta}_\alpha^{\,i}(\phi) = \prod_{a \in V_\alpha^*} \delta\left(\phi_a - h - \delta\boldsymbol{h} - \delta\boldsymbol{h}_\alpha^{\,i}\right) \tag{6.3}$$

and where $\delta\boldsymbol{h}$ and $\delta\boldsymbol{h}_\alpha^{\,i}$ are independent random parameters distributed according to

$$\boldsymbol{h} - h = \delta\boldsymbol{h} \sim \bar{p} : \Lambda \to [0,1]. \tag{6.4}$$

$$\boldsymbol{h}_\alpha^{\,i} - \boldsymbol{h} = \delta\boldsymbol{h}_\alpha^{\,i} \sim \bar{p}_\alpha^{\,i} : \Lambda \to [0,1]. \tag{6.5}$$

We can obtain $\bar{p}_\alpha^i$ from the partition by first computing p_α^i and then using the convolution rule

$$\bar{p}(\theta) = \int_{x \in \Lambda} p(x)\ \delta(\theta + x - h)\, dx, \tag{6.6}$$

$$\bar{p}_\alpha^{\,i}(\theta) = \int_{x \in \Lambda} p_\alpha^i(x)\ p(\theta + x)\, dx, \tag{6.7}$$

It is clear that we can generalize the above by adding an arbitrary number of intermediate steps to obtain a better approximation in cut distance. We identify this iteration with the $L-$RSB approximation of [2].

To give a representation of the $L-$RSB measure we will need an adequate notation for the refinements of (V, S). Then, let N_ℓ, $0 \leq \ell \leq L$ be a set of

integers such that $N_0 = 1$, $N_1 N_2 \dots N_{L-1} = N_L = N$, and define the following sequence of refinements,

$$(V_\ell,\, S_\ell) = (\{V_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_\ell}\}\,,\, \{S_{\boldsymbol{i}_\ell}\}) \tag{6.8}$$

obtained by recursively joining the blocks of a regular partition initially composed by a large number N of (small) regular sets. More formally, it holds

$$V_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{\ell-1}} = \bigcup_{\alpha_\ell=1}^{N_{\ell-1}} V_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_\ell},\; S_{\boldsymbol{i}_{\ell-1}} = \bigcup_{\alpha_\ell=1}^{N_{\ell-1}} S_{\boldsymbol{i}_\ell}, \tag{6.9}$$

and the converse $V_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_\ell} \subseteq V_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{\ell-1}},\; S_{\boldsymbol{i}_\ell} \subseteq S_{\boldsymbol{i}_{\ell-1}}$. Both in the above definition and in the followings we will use the abbreviations $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_\ell = \alpha_1 \alpha_2 \dots \alpha_\ell$ and $\boldsymbol{i}_\ell = i_1 i_2 \dots i_\ell$ for the static vectors of the refinement indexes that encode the tree structure (despite the notation using bold symbols is not completely incidental $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_\ell$ and $\boldsymbol{i}_\ell$ are non-random in this formulation).

Then, the $L-$RSB measure can be better defined recursively starting from the bottom

$$\boldsymbol{\zeta}^{\boldsymbol{i}_L}_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_L}(\phi) = \prod_{a \in V^*_\alpha} \delta(\, \phi_a - h - \delta \boldsymbol{h}^0_0 - \sum_{\ell=1}^{L} \delta \boldsymbol{h}^{\boldsymbol{i}_\ell}_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_\ell}\,) \tag{6.10}$$

where $\delta \boldsymbol{h}^{\boldsymbol{i}_\ell}_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_\ell}$ are independent centered random parameters for each $\boldsymbol{i}_\ell$ and $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_\ell$, distributed according to

$$\delta \boldsymbol{h}^{\boldsymbol{i}_\ell}_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_\ell} \sim \bar{p}^{\boldsymbol{i}_\ell}_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_\ell} : \Lambda \to [0,1]\,. \tag{6.11}$$

Given the RSB structure described before, we can compute

$$\hat{p}^{\boldsymbol{i}_\ell}_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_\ell}(\theta) = \left|V^*_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_\ell}\right| \prod_{a \in V^*_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_\ell}} \hat{\xi}^{\boldsymbol{i}_\ell}_a, \tag{6.12}$$

and link $p^{\boldsymbol{i}_\ell}_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_\ell}$ and $\bar{p}^{\boldsymbol{i}_\ell}_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_\ell}$ adding the self-consistency assumption between layers

$$\delta \boldsymbol{h}^{\boldsymbol{i}_\ell}_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_\ell} = \boldsymbol{h}^{\boldsymbol{i}_\ell}_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_\ell} - \boldsymbol{h}^{\boldsymbol{i}_{\ell-1}}_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{\ell-1}} \tag{6.13}$$

as in the 1RSB case. From composition rule between layers we obtain

$$\bar{p}^{\boldsymbol{i}_\ell}_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_\ell}(\theta) = \int_{x \in \Lambda} p^{\boldsymbol{i}_\ell}_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_\ell}(x)\; p^{\boldsymbol{i}_{\ell-1}}_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{\ell-1}}(\theta + x)\, dx, \tag{6.14}$$

where $\bar{p}^{\boldsymbol{i}_\ell}_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_\ell}(\theta)$ is distributed as the difference between two independent levels (this should correspond to a consistency condition between the random hypersurfaces that are described in [14, 15]). That said, the ζ_{L-RSB} measure is obtained trough the recursion

$$\boldsymbol{\zeta}^{\boldsymbol{i}_{\ell-1}}_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{\ell-1}}(\phi) = \frac{1}{N_{\ell-1}} \sum_{i_\ell=1}^{N_{\ell-1}} \prod_{\alpha_\ell=1}^{N_{\ell-1}} \mathbb{E}_{\bar{p}^{\boldsymbol{i}_\ell}_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_\ell}} \boldsymbol{\zeta}^{\boldsymbol{i}_\ell}_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_\ell}(\phi)\,, \tag{6.15}$$

until the last level, which finally gives

$$\zeta_{L-RSB}(\phi) = \mathbb{E}_{\bar{p}_0^0}\, \boldsymbol{\zeta}_0^0(\phi) = \mathbb{E}_{\bar{p}_0^0} \frac{1}{N_0} \sum_{i_1=1}^{N_0} \prod_{\alpha_1=1}^{N_0} \mathbb{E}_{\bar{p}_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_1}^{\boldsymbol{i}_1}} \boldsymbol{\zeta}_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_1}^{\boldsymbol{i}_1}(\phi)\,. \tag{6.16}$$

Notice that $L-$RSB is a very sophisticated mean field theory, as it acts on the algebra of the events by assuming a correlation structure similar to the sequence of filtered algebras that define martingale processes, ie given the kernel sequence associated to the measures above (assume for simplicity $\{h_\alpha^i\} = 0$) we find

$$\mathbb{E}\left(H_{\boldsymbol{\zeta}_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_\ell}^{\boldsymbol{i}_\ell}} \,|\, H_{\boldsymbol{\zeta}_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{\ell-1}}^{\boldsymbol{i}_{\ell-1}}} \right) = H_{\boldsymbol{\zeta}_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{\ell-1}}^{\boldsymbol{i}_{\ell-1}}} + \mathbb{E}_{\bar{p}_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_\ell}^{\boldsymbol{i}_\ell}} \left(H_{\boldsymbol{\zeta}_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_\ell}^{\boldsymbol{i}_\ell}} - H_{\boldsymbol{\zeta}_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{\ell-1}}^{\boldsymbol{i}_{\ell-1}}} \right) = H_{\boldsymbol{\zeta}_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{\ell-1}}^{\boldsymbol{i}_{\ell-1}}}\,. \tag{6.17}$$

This property has been first observed by Guerra in [14, 15], where it is proven using different techniques that the pure states of the RSB ansatz admit a martingale representation. We expect that the convolution rule before should be strictly related to the Guerra Interpolation Technique [3], as it defines the relative distribution between two layers of our kernels.

Notice that this allows a straightforward generalization to the continuous RSB case (fullRSB, where ℓ is a continuous parameter) as it only need to redefine the kernel sequence to be a continuous martingale and then take the limit of the convolution rule above, obtaining what is essentially an iterated version of the Doob Martingale Representation. See [16] for a review on Martingale Theory. Quite interestingly, a very close construction is used in Chapter 9 of [9] to prove the compactness of the graphon space in cut distance.

Since it would require substantial changes in the notation, for explanatory purposes we do not workout the continuous version in the present paper. We also believe that the discrete case forms a better ground to understand the physical meaning of the RSB ansatz as it offers an interesting extra cue that would be partially hidden by a continuous reformulation, as we shall see at the end of Section 8.

Anyway, for the interested reader we remark that in case of multivariate gaussian measures this could be done by simply implementing the convolution rule presented in this section to the elegant formulation of [14, 15].

7 RSB ansatz and Parisi measure

To introduce the Parisi ansatz it will be convenient to restrict our analysis to the special case of Multivariate Gaussian measures. For simplicity, we compute the Parisi measure only in the case without external field, hence we assume that the averages of the fields on the pure states vanishes (ie, $h_\alpha^i = 0$). Notice that Gaussian measures are invariant by convolution, hence it is evident that the pure states can be encoded by multivariate gaussian distributions.

Before giving the Parisi measure it will be interesting to investigate the intermediate stage and explicitly compute the case of Gaussian $L-$RSB measures, which is uniquely defined in cut distance by the sequence of arrays

$$\Gamma_\ell = \left\{ \gamma^{\boldsymbol{i}_\ell} \right\},\ \gamma^{\boldsymbol{i}_\ell} = \left\{ \gamma_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_\ell}^{\boldsymbol{i}_\ell} \right\}. \tag{7.1}$$

From definitions we can take $\delta \boldsymbol{h}_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_\ell}^{\boldsymbol{i}_\ell} = \gamma_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_\ell}^{\boldsymbol{i}_\ell} \boldsymbol{z}_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_\ell}^{\boldsymbol{i}_\ell}$, and start with

$$\boldsymbol{\zeta}_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_L}^{\boldsymbol{i}_L}(\phi) = \prod_{a \in V_\alpha^*} \delta(\phi_a - \gamma_0^0 \boldsymbol{z}_0^0 - \sum_{\ell=1}^{L} \gamma_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_\ell}^{\boldsymbol{i}_\ell} \boldsymbol{z}_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_\ell}^{\boldsymbol{i}_\ell}) \tag{7.2}$$

where the random parameters are independent variables identically distributed according to centered normal distribution of unitary variance

$$\boldsymbol{z}_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_\ell}^{\boldsymbol{i}_\ell} \sim \mathcal{N}_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_\ell}^{\boldsymbol{i}_\ell} = \mathcal{N}(0,1), \tag{7.3}$$

Then we apply the averaging recursion from $\ell = L$

$$\boldsymbol{\zeta}_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{\ell-1}}^{\boldsymbol{i}_{\ell-1}}(\phi) = \frac{1}{N_{\ell-1}} \sum_{i_\ell=1}^{N_{\ell-1}} \prod_{\alpha_\ell=1}^{N_{\ell-1}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{N}_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_\ell}^{\boldsymbol{i}_\ell}} \boldsymbol{\zeta}_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_\ell}^{\boldsymbol{i}_\ell}(\phi) \tag{7.4}$$

down to $\ell = 0$, obtaining the desired expression

$$\zeta_{L-RSBg}(\phi) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{N}_0^0} \boldsymbol{\zeta}_0^0(\phi) \tag{7.5}$$

Notice that even if the above array Γ is exponentially large in ℓ the convolution relations between the layers ensure that the entries are uniquely defined by the regularity partition.

We can compute the $n-$point correlation function for some smooth positive function G

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \langle \prod_{a=1}^{n} G(\boldsymbol{h}_a) \rangle_{\zeta_{L-RSBg}}^{1/n} = \sup_{\{i_\ell\}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{N}_0^0} \boldsymbol{G}_0^0 \tag{7.6}$$

with $\boldsymbol{G}_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_1}^{\boldsymbol{i}_1}$ obtained from the recursive formula

$$\boldsymbol{G}_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{\ell-1}}^{\boldsymbol{i}_{\ell-1}} = \prod_{\alpha_\ell=1}^{N_{\ell-1}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{N}_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_\ell}^{\boldsymbol{i}_\ell}} \boldsymbol{G}_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_\ell}^{\boldsymbol{i}_\ell}, \tag{7.7}$$

and initial condition given by

$$\boldsymbol{G}_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_L}^{\boldsymbol{i}_L} = G(\sum_{\ell=0}^{L} \gamma_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_\ell}^{\boldsymbol{i}_\ell} \boldsymbol{z}_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_\ell}^{\boldsymbol{i}_\ell}). \tag{7.8}$$

We can also give an explicit expression of the limit overlap matrix in therms of the Γ_ℓ arrays. From definitions we obtain

$$Q_{\zeta_{L-RSBg}}(\boldsymbol{h}, \boldsymbol{h}') = \sum_{\{i_\ell\}} \sum_{\{j_\ell\}} q^{\boldsymbol{i}_L \boldsymbol{j}_L} \mathbb{I}_{\left\{\boldsymbol{h} \in S_{\boldsymbol{i}_L}^*, \boldsymbol{h}' \in S_{\boldsymbol{j}_L}^*\right\}} \tag{7.9}$$

with support of the overlaps given by

$$q^{\boldsymbol{i}_L \boldsymbol{j}_L} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\{\alpha_\ell\}} \sum_{\ell=1}^{L} \gamma_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_L}^{\boldsymbol{i}_\ell} \gamma_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_L}^{\boldsymbol{j}_\ell} \mathbb{I}_{\{\ell \leq \ell^*(\boldsymbol{i}_L, \boldsymbol{j}_L)\}}, \tag{7.10}$$

where $\ell^*(\boldsymbol{i}_\ell, \boldsymbol{j}_\ell)$ returns the number of common regular sets along the refinements for two given pure states indexes $\boldsymbol{i}_\ell, \boldsymbol{j}_\ell$, explicitly

$$\ell^*(\boldsymbol{i}_L, \boldsymbol{j}_L) = \sum_{\ell=1}^{L} \prod_{\ell'=1}^{\ell} \delta_{i_{\ell'}, j_{\ell'}}. \tag{7.11}$$

Notice that even if the dependence from $\ell^*(\boldsymbol{i}_L, \boldsymbol{j}_L)$ imply a hierarchical organization of the overlap support, this is not necessarily ultrametric (to obtain ultrametricity we need to assume also weak exchangeability, as we shall see in short). Although we do not discuss this here, we believe that this generalized hierarchical approximation could find useful applications in studying models that exhibit a non self-averaging free energy density respect to the disorder. This may include a large class of Diluted Mean Field Models, and eventually Short Range models in mean field regime. Moreover, we conjecture the above variational principle to be equivalent to the Random Overlap Structure of Aizenman et Al. [12]

Here we arrive to the Parisi measure. If we assume exchangeability the pure states must have identical fluctuation amplitudes for each level, ie for each size of the blocks. Then we can take

$$\gamma_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_\ell}^{\boldsymbol{i}_\ell} = \gamma_{\mathbf{1}_\ell}^{\mathbf{1}_\ell} = \gamma_\ell \tag{7.12}$$

and define the Parisi measure recursively up to

$$\zeta_{Parisi}(\phi) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{N}_0^0} \boldsymbol{\zeta}_0^0(\phi) \tag{7.13}$$

by following the usual recursion rule

$$\boldsymbol{\zeta}_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{\ell-1}}^{\boldsymbol{i}_{\ell-1}}(\phi) = \frac{1}{N_{\ell-1}} \sum_{i_\ell=1}^{N_{\ell-1}} \prod_{\alpha_\ell=1}^{N_{\ell-1}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{N}_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_\ell}^{\boldsymbol{i}_\ell}} \boldsymbol{\zeta}_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_\ell}^{\boldsymbol{i}_\ell}(\phi) \tag{7.14}$$

with initial state given by the Dirac measure

$$\boldsymbol{\zeta}_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_L}^{\boldsymbol{i}_L}(\phi) = \prod_{a \in V_\alpha^*} \delta(\phi_a - \sum_{\ell=0}^{L} \gamma_\ell \boldsymbol{z}_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_\ell}^{\boldsymbol{i}_\ell}). \tag{7.15}$$

Since by exchangeability the pure states are not distinguished by local averages we can consistently simplify our notation by dropping the supremum on the possible patterns $\{i_\ell\}$ and compute the average for just one pattern of refinement, say the first one. Then, abbreviating

$$\boldsymbol{z}_{\mathbf{1}_\ell}^{\mathbf{1}_\ell} = \boldsymbol{z}_\ell \sim \mathcal{N}_\ell = \mathcal{N}(0,1) \tag{7.16}$$

and redefining for simplicity

$$\boldsymbol{Y}_{\ell-1} = \boldsymbol{G}_{\mathbf{1}_{\ell-1}}^{\mathbf{1}_{\ell-1}} \tag{7.17}$$

we arrive to a familiar expression that shows the same recursion needed to compute the cavity part of the Parisi functional, ie

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \langle \prod_{a=1}^{n} G\left(\boldsymbol{h}_a\right) \rangle_{\zeta_{Parisi}}^{1/n} = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{N}_0} \boldsymbol{Y}_0 \,, \tag{7.18}$$

whit recursion given by

$$\boldsymbol{Y}_{\ell-1}^{1/N_{\ell-1}} = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{N}_\ell} \boldsymbol{Y}_\ell \tag{7.19}$$

and initial condition

$$\boldsymbol{Y}_L = G\,(\sum_{\ell=0}^{L} \gamma_\ell\, \boldsymbol{z}_\ell\,). \tag{7.20}$$

Notice that not only the notation is simplified, but we have actually reduced the number of independent variables to only one independent functional order parameter implicitly defined by the two sequences N_ℓ and γ_ℓ. Most important, the overlap matrix obtained from this measure

$$Q_{\zeta_{Parisi}}\left(\boldsymbol{h}, \boldsymbol{h}'\right) = \sum_{\{i_\ell\}} \sum_{\{j_\ell\}} q^{\boldsymbol{i}_L \boldsymbol{j}_L} \mathbb{I}_{\left\{\boldsymbol{h}\in S^*_{\boldsymbol{i}_L},\, \boldsymbol{h}'\in S^*_{\boldsymbol{j}_L}\right\}} \tag{7.21}$$

has ultrametric support, as one can see from its expression

$$q^{\boldsymbol{i}_L \boldsymbol{j}_L} = \sum_{\ell=1}^{L} \gamma_\ell^2\, \mathbb{I}_{\,\{\ell \le \ell^*(\boldsymbol{i}_L, \boldsymbol{j}_L)\}}. \tag{7.22}$$

To avoid long detours, in the present paper we won't further discuss the origin of ultrametricity, nor the connection with the classical probabilistic Point Process description of [5] (although it is not hard to prove that the random parameters of the above measure will be distributed according to a Ruelle Cascade).

Anyway, it worth notice that in our setting ultrametricity arises as consequence of weak exchangeability and the RSB filtered algebra described before, and we expect that these requirements should correspond respectively to the Stochastic Stability introduced in [11] and the Separability assumption discussed in [17]. It is also noteworthy the similarity of the partition structure with the Cantor set.

8 The SK model.

We are now ready to apply our considerations to the the Sherrington-Kirckpatrick (SK) model.

First we deal with the computation of the Parisi functional (for our convenience we only consider the case without the external magnetic field). The SK model is described by the Hamiltonian

$$\mathcal{H}_J\left(\sigma\right) = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{n}} \sum_{1\le a,b\le n} J_{ab}\, \sigma_a \sigma_b, \tag{8.1}$$

where $J = \{J_{ab}\}$ is a symmetric matrix with entries independently extracted from a centered normal distribution $\mathcal{N}(0,1)$ and such that $J_{ab} = J_{ba}$, $J_{aa} = 0$. The associated Gibbs measure for a given J is

$$\rho_J(\sigma) = \frac{1}{Z_J} e^{-\beta \mathcal{H}_J(\sigma)},\ Z_J = \sum_{\sigma \in \Omega^n} e^{-\beta \mathcal{H}_J(\sigma)} \tag{8.2}$$

We denote by $\mathcal{N}_J$ the distribution from which the instance J is extracted. The main task is to compute the averaged free energy

$$\bar{f} = \lim_{n\to\infty} n^{-1}\, \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{N}_J} \log Z_{\boldsymbol{J}}, \tag{8.3}$$

with $\boldsymbol{J} \sim \mathcal{N}_J$, which is provided by the celebrated formula by Parisi.

Let L be the number of RSBs and take two real positive sequences $\{\lambda_\ell\}$ and $\{q_\ell\}$ such that $\lambda_0 = q_0 = 0,\ \lambda_{L+1} = q_{L+1} = 1$ and

$$\lambda_{\ell-1} \le \lambda_\ell,\ q_{\ell-1} \le q_\ell, \tag{8.4}$$

Now consider the random quantity

$$\boldsymbol{Z}_L = \cosh\big(\,\beta \sum_{\ell=0}^{L} \boldsymbol{z}_\ell \sqrt{q_{\ell+1} - q_\ell}\,\big), \tag{8.5}$$

where $\boldsymbol{z}_\ell$ are i.i.d. standard Gaussian random variables of unitary variance, and iterate the formula

$$\boldsymbol{Z}_{\ell-1}^{\lambda_\ell} = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{N}_\ell}\, \boldsymbol{Z}_\ell^{\lambda_\ell} \tag{8.6}$$

up to Z_1. Then the Parisi functional is

$$f_L = \log 2 + \log Z_1 - \frac{\beta^2}{2} \sum_{\ell=1}^{L} \lambda_\ell \left(q_{\ell+1}^2 - q_\ell^2\right) \tag{8.7}$$

Notice that in case of zero external field no randomness remains after the iterations of Eq. (8.6), because in SK the free energy is self-averaging respect to the disorder. It has been argued by Parisi, then proved by Guerra and Talagrand, that

$$\bar{f} = \inf_{L, \{\lambda_\ell\}, \{q_\ell\}} f_L. \tag{8.8}$$

To derive the above formula we will use the Cavity Representation of the SK free energy [2, 10, 12], here we use the version of Aizenmann et Al. [12], [13]

$$A_{\boldsymbol{J}} = \log 2 + \log \langle \prod_{a=1}^{k} \cosh\left(\beta\, h_a\left(\boldsymbol{\sigma}\right)\right) \rangle_{\rho'_{\boldsymbol{J}}}^{1/k} - \log \langle\, e^{\,\beta \sqrt{\frac{k}{2}}\, \kappa(\boldsymbol{\sigma}))}\, \rangle_{\rho'_{\boldsymbol{J}}}^{1/k} \tag{8.9}$$

where $\langle\,\cdot\,\rangle_{\rho'_J}$ denotes the average with respect to the Gibbs measure ρ'_J of Hamiltonian

$$\mathcal{H}'_J(\sigma) = \frac{\beta'}{2\sqrt{n}} \sum_{1 \le a < b \le n} J_{ab}\, \sigma_a \sigma_b,\ \beta' = \beta \sqrt{\tfrac{n}{n+k}}. \tag{8.10}$$

In the above formulas $h(\boldsymbol{\sigma})$ is the vector of the cavity variables for the $n+k$ system,

$$h_a(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{b=1}^{n} J'_{ab} \boldsymbol{\sigma}_b, \tag{8.11}$$

the sequence $\{J'_{ab}\}$ is another additional set of independently extracted standard Gaussian couplings, and $\kappa(\boldsymbol{\sigma})$ is a Gaussian field with overlap matrix given by

$$\kappa(\boldsymbol{\sigma})\,\kappa(\boldsymbol{\sigma}') = \frac{1}{2}\,|\,h(\boldsymbol{\sigma})\,h(\boldsymbol{\sigma}')|^{\,2}. \tag{8.12}$$

For the SK model the free energy density is self averaging respect to the disorder, then holds

$$\bar{f} = \lim_{k\to\infty} \lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{N}_J} A_{\boldsymbol{J}} = \lim_{k\to\infty} \lim_{n\to\infty} A_{\boldsymbol{J}} = f_{\boldsymbol{J}},\ a.s. \tag{8.13}$$

Since it is proven that the SK model is exactly solved by the RSB ansatz we expect that computing the average according to the Parisi measure ζ_{Parisi} presented in the previous section should provide the correct formula. We show that this is the case

Theorem 5. *The free energy density associated to the probability measure presented in Eq.s (7.13), (7.14) and (7.15) of the previous section is the Parisi functional.*

Proof. We start by noticing that since the sets $\{J'_{ab}\}$ are independent for each cavity field but coupled to the same realization $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$, then each additional cavity field $h_a(\boldsymbol{\sigma})$ will be distributed the same as the previous for $n \to \infty$. Then by Eq. (5.18) we can represent A_J as the global minimum of the functional

$$\mathcal{A}_J[\,\xi\,] = \log 2 + \log \langle \prod_{a=1}^{k} \cosh(\beta\,\boldsymbol{h}_a) \rangle_{\xi}^{1/k} - \log \langle\, e^{\,\beta\sqrt{\frac{k}{2}}\,\boldsymbol{\kappa})} \,\rangle_{\xi'(\xi)}^{1/k} \tag{8.14}$$

for $\xi \in \mathcal{P}(\Lambda^n)$. In the above definition ξ is the law of the cavity field $\boldsymbol{h} = \{\boldsymbol{h}_a\}$ and $\boldsymbol{\kappa}$ is distributed according to the gaussian field $\xi'(\xi)$ with overlap matrix $2\,\boldsymbol{\kappa}\boldsymbol{\kappa}' = |\,\boldsymbol{h}\boldsymbol{h}'|^2$ as in Eq. (8.12). The convergence in cut distance implies *weak** convergence, then by Eq. (4.5) and Lemma 4 holds in general that

$$f_J = \lim_{k\to\infty} \lim_{n\to\infty} \inf_{\xi\in\mathcal{P}(\Lambda^n)} \mathcal{A}_J[\,\xi\,] = \lim_{N\to\infty} \lim_{k\to\infty} \lim_{n\to\infty} \inf_{M\in\Lambda^{nN}} \mathcal{A}_J[\,\zeta\,]. \tag{8.15}$$

Let compute the cavity part assuming $\xi = \zeta_{Parisi}$. We can use again Eq. (5.18) and compute the average as shown in the previous section

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \lim_{n\to\infty} \langle \prod_{a=1}^{k} \cosh(\beta\boldsymbol{h}_a) \rangle_{\zeta_{Parisi}}^{1/k} = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{N}_0} \boldsymbol{Y}_0\,, \tag{8.16}$$

with $\boldsymbol{Y}_0$ obtained trough the recursive formula

$$\boldsymbol{Y}_{\ell-1}^{1/N_{\ell-1}} = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{N}_\ell} \boldsymbol{Y}_\ell \tag{8.17}$$

and starting from the initial condition

$$\boldsymbol{Y}_L = \cosh(\,\beta \sum_{\ell=0}^{L} \gamma_\ell \, \boldsymbol{z}_\ell\,). \tag{8.18}$$

Now we can confront with the Parisi formula. Notice that to ensure the same initial condition we have to take $\gamma_\ell = \sqrt{q_{\ell+1} - q_\ell}$. Then we can invert the relation to find

$$q_\ell = \sum_{\ell'=1}^{\ell} \gamma_{\ell'}^2 \tag{8.19}$$

which is consistent with the expression for the overlap matrix given in Eq. (7.21). Moreover, by substituting

$$N_{\ell-1} = \lambda_\ell/\lambda_{\ell-1},\ \boldsymbol{Z}_\ell^{\lambda_{\ell+1}} = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{N}_\ell} \boldsymbol{Y}_\ell \tag{8.20}$$

we can see that also the recursion is the same of Eq. (8.6). It is not necessary to actually compute the reaction therm as its value is completely determined by the overlap matrix in Eq. (7.21), which we know is the correct one. □

We conclude by sketching a result that gives an interesting physical insight on the parameters $\{\lambda_\ell\}$. In the above computation we worked under the assumption that

$$|S_{\boldsymbol{i}_\ell}| = |V_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_\ell}| = \prod_{\ell'=0}^{\ell-1} 1/N_{\ell'} = \lambda_\ell \tag{8.21}$$

but since the beginning (actually in Section 2) we remarked that we could have taken different rates between the volumes of the partitions, say

$$|S_{\boldsymbol{i}_\ell}| = s_\ell,\ |V_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_\ell}| = v_\ell, \tag{8.22}$$

without effects in cut distance as far as $N \to \infty$. It is a known fact that the Parisi ansatz is not the unique analytic continuation for the replicated partition function (see for example [2, 15]), and considering different scalings for the partitions may allow us to impose additional symmetries that can give some physical consistency also to the finite RSB approximation.

Let consider the following generalization of the Parisi Formula. If we assume Eq. (8.22) from the beginning and repeat the computation we finally obtain a Parisi type functional

$$f'_L = \log 2 + \log Z'_1 - \frac{\beta^2}{2} \sum_{\ell=1}^{L} s_\ell \left(q_{\ell+1}^2 - q_\ell^2\right), \tag{8.23}$$

where the cavity part is computed according to

$$\boldsymbol{Z}_{\ell-1}^{v_\ell} = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{N}_\ell} \boldsymbol{Z}_\ell^{v_\ell} \tag{8.24}$$

as in Eq. (8.6) with v_ℓ on behalf of λ_ℓ.

$$\bar{f} = \inf_{L,\{v_\ell\},\{s_\ell\},\{q_\ell\}} f'_L. \tag{8.25}$$

Notice that the parameters $\{v_\ell\}$ of the spin space only affects the cavity part, while the pure states parameters $\{s_\ell\}$ act on the correction, that indeed encodes the off-diagonal part of the overlap matrix.

It is well known that for $s_\ell = v_\ell = \lambda_\ell$ the Parisi Formula gives non-physical results for a finite level of RSB and sufficiently small temperatures. In particular, the ground state energy diverges for any finite L. Notice that simulacra of this phenomenon are observed also in the fullRSB case. For example, in [18] it is shown that the finiteness of the fullRSB ground state energy comes trough a remarkable cancellation between the two contributions. In the above generalization we have one more free parameter and can produce approximations with finite ground state as follows. From definition of ground state energy we have

$$E_{GS} = \lim_{\beta\to\infty} \partial_\beta f'_L. \tag{8.26}$$

Then, it can be shown after some algebra that the limit

$$\lim_{\beta\to\infty} \beta^{-1}\partial_\beta \log Z'_1 = \mathcal{I}_L\left(\{q_\ell\},\{v_\ell\}\right) \tag{8.27}$$

is finite for any finite choice of the parameters $\{v_\ell\}$ and $\{q_\ell\}$, with Z'_1 obtained iterating Eq. (8.6) for fixed L and $\{v_\ell\}$ on behalf of $\{\lambda_\ell\}$.

We can see that the contribution of the cavity part and that of the reaction therm diverges as $O(\beta)$, and to obtain a finite ground state for a choice of the triple $\{q_\ell\}$, $\{v_\ell\}$ and $\{s_\ell\}$ we need to impose (at least) the following stability condition

$$\mathcal{I}_L\left(\{q_\ell\},\{v_\ell\}\right) = \sum_{\ell=1}^{L} s_\ell\left(q^2_{\ell+1} - q^2_\ell\right). \tag{8.28}$$

The E_{GS} is finite for any functional order parameter satisfying the above. Then, calling $\mathcal{G}$ the subset of these parameters we can minimize on it being sure that the free energy density we are going to find will be at least physically consistent (finite ground state and positive entropy)

$$\bar{f}_L = \inf_{\{v_\ell\},\{s_\ell\},\{q_\ell\}\,\in\,\mathcal{G}} f'_L. \tag{8.29}$$

Notice that since we expect $\bar{f}_L$ to converge uniformly in L toward the correct SK value for any finite β this fact could eventually be a good starting point to concretely investigate if the filtration induced by a finite RSB is only a mathematical trick to aproximate the fullRSB case or can be tributed of some physical meaning by its own.

9 Acknowledgment

I wish to thank Amin Coja-Oghlan, Giorgio Parisi, Francesco Guerra, Pietro Caputo, Nicola Kistler and Riccardo Balzan for interesting discussions and suggestions.

The research leading to these results has received funding from the European Research Council under the European Union's Seventh Framework Programme (FP/2007-2013) / ERC Grant Agreement n. 278857–PTCC.

References

[1] G. Parisi, *A sequence of approximate solutions to the S-K model for spin glasses*, Journal of Physics A 13 (1980).

[2] G. Parisi, M. Mezard, M. Virasoro, *Spin Glass theory and Beyond*, World Scientific (1987).

[3] F. Guerra, *Broken replica symmetry bounds in the mean field spin glass model*, Communications in Mathematical Physics 233 (2003).

[4] M. Talagrand, *The Parisi Formula*, Annals of Mathematics 163 (2006).

[5] D. Panchenko, *The Sherrington-Kirckpatrick Model*, Springer (2013).

[6] V. Bapst, A. Coja-Oghlan, *Harnessing the Bethe Free Energy*, http://arxiv.org/abs/1504.03975 (2015).

[7] A. Coja-Oghlan, W. Perkins, K. Skubch, *Limits of discrete distributions and Gibbs measures on random graphs*, https://arxiv.org/abs/1512.06798 (2015).

[8] E. Szemerédi, *Regular partitions of graphs*, Problèmes combinatoires et théorie des graphes, Colloques Internationaux du CNRS, 260, Paris (1978).

[9] L. Lovasz, *Large Networks and Graph Limits*, AMS Colloquim Publications 60 (2012).

[10] M. Mezard, G. Parisi, *The Cavity method at Zero Temperature,* Journal of Statistical Physics 111 (2003).

[11] M. Aizenman, P. Contucci, *On the Stability of the Quenched state in Mean Field Spin Glass Models*, Journal of Statistical Physics 92 (1998).

[12] M. Aizenman, R. Sims, S. Starr, *An extended variational principle for the SK spin-glass model*, Physical Review B 68 (2003).

[13] E. Bolthausen, A. Bovier, *Spin Glasses*, Springer Berlin (2007).

[14] F. Guerra, *Fluctuations and thermodynamic variables in mean field spin glass models,* Stochastic Processes, Physics and Geometry II, World Scientific Singapore (1995).

[15] F. Guerra, *Functional order parameters for the quenched free energy in mean field spin glass models*, Field Theory and Collective Phenomena, World Scientific Singapore (1995).

[16] D. Williams, *Probability with Martingales*, Cambridge University Press (1991).

[17] G. Parisi, F. Ricci-Tersenghi, *On the origin of ultrametricity*, Journal of Physics A 33 (2000).

[18] A. Auffinger, W.-K. Chen, *Parisi formula for the ground state energy in the mixed p-spin model*, https://arxiv.org/abs/1606.05335 (2016).